ATTACHMENT 102

Case 3:21-cv-03496-AMO Document 230-52 Filed 05/17/24 Page 2 of 11 *** CONFIDENTIAL ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY ***

```
1
                      UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 2
                FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 3
                         SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
 4
       SURGICAL INSTRUMENT SERVICE
       COMPANY, INC.,
 5
                                       ) Case No.:
                                       ) 3:21-cv-03496-VC
 6
                  Plaintiff,
                                        ) Lead Case No.:
 7
                                        ) 3:21-cv-03825-VC
             vs.
       INTUITIVE SURGICAL, INC.,
 8
                  Defendant
 9
10
       IN RE: DA VINCI SURGICAL ROBOT )
       ANTITRUST LITIGATION
11
       THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:
12
       ALL ACTIONS
13
14
                *** CONFIDENTIAL ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY ***
15
                         30(b)(6) DEPOSITION OF:
16
17
                          KEITH ROBERT JOHNSON
18
                        THURSDAY, OCTOBER 27, 2022
19
                    9:06 a.m. Mountain Standard Time
20
       REPORTED BY:
21
22
       Vickie Blair
23
       CSR No. 8940, RPR-CRR
24
       JOB NO. 5539883
25
       PAGES 1 - 122
                                                    Page 1
```

Case 3:21-cv-03496-AMO Document 230-52 Filed 05/17/24 Page 3 of 11 *** CONFIDENTIAL ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY ***

1	Deposition of KEITH ROBERT JOHNSON, the witness, taken
2	on behalf of the Defendant, on Thursday,
3	October 27, 2022, 9:06 a.m. Mountain Standard Time,
4	before VICKIE BLAIR, CSR No. 8940, RPR-CRR.
5	
6	APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL VIA ZOOM:
7	
8	FOR PLAINTIFF/COUNTER-DEFENDANT SURGICAL INSTRUMENT
	SERVICE CO. INC.:
9	
	HALEY GUILIANO LLP
10	BY JOSHUA VAN HOVEN, Partner
	111 North Market Street, Suite 900
11	San Jose, California 95113
	+1 669 213 1061
12	joshua.vanhoven@hglaw.com
13	
14	FOR DEFENDANT INTUITIVE SURGICAL, INC.:
	COVINGTON & BURLING LLP
15	BY ISAAC D. CHAPUT, Associate
	415 Mission Street
16	Suite 5400
	San Francisco, California 94105-2533
17	+1 415 591 7020
18	ichaput@cov.com
	COVINGTON & BURLING LLP
19	BY AUSTIN S. MARTIN, Associate
	One CityCenter
20	850 Tenth Street, NW
	Washington, D.C. 20001-4956
21	+1 202 662 5094
22	amartin@cov.com
23	
24	
25	
	Page 2

Case 3:21-cv-03496-AMO Document 230-52 Filed 05/17/24 Page 4 of 11 *** CONFIDENTIAL ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY ***

1	APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL VIA ZOOM: (Continued)
2	FOR THE PROPOSED CLASS:
3	BONI, ZACK & SNYDER LLC
	BY JOSHUA D. SNYDER, Partner
4	15 St. Asaphs Road
	Bala Cynwyd, Pennsylvania 19004
5	(610) 822-0203
	(610) 822-0206
6	jsnyder@bonizack.com
7	
8	ALSO PRESENT:
9	RAMON A. PERAZA, Videographer
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	Page 3

Case 3:21-cv-03496-AMO Document 230-52 Filed 05/17/24 Page 5 of 11 *** CONFIDENTIAL ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY ***

1	Q All right. I will take breaks from time	09:10:47
2	to time. If you need a break for some reason, just let	09:10:50
3	me know, I'll do my best to accommodate that. I might	09:10:52
4	just have a few more questions that I ask that we take	09:10:55
5	before we go on break.	09:11:01
6	Is there any reason you can't provide full	09:11:02
7	and accurate testimony today?	09:11:04
8	A None.	09:11:06
9	Q Okay. I'd like to mark as Defendant's	09:11:06
10	Exhibit 135 Intuitive's notice of deposition to	09:11:12
11	Surgical Instrument Company.	09:11:18
12	Austin, that is tab one.	09:11:34
13	All right. That's available for you on	09:11:40
14	the Exhibit Share platform now, Mr. Johnson.	09:11:42
15	Do you recognize what we've marked as	09:11:47
16	Defendant's Exhibit 135?	09:11:50
17	A I don't see it. Where do I click? I'm	09:11:51
18	sorry.	09:11:54
19	(Deposition Exhibit 135 was marked	09:11:54
20	for identification and is attached	09:11:54
21	hereto.)	09:11:55
22	BY MR. CHAPUT:	09:11:55
23	Q So if you just refresh the screen, then it	09:11:55
24	will show up.	09:11:57
25	A Are we under the Keith Johnson file or the	09:12:07
		Page 10

Case 3:21-cv-03496-AMO Document 230-52 Filed 05/17/24 Page 6 of 11 *** CONFIDENTIAL ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY ***

I		
1	Surgical Instrument file?	09:12:10
2	Q The Surgical Instrument file, it's	09:12:13
3	probably the bottom file on your on your screen.	09:12:16
4	A Okay, I have it.	09:12:21
5	Q And do you recognize Exhibit 135?	09:12:23
6	A Yes.	09:12:34
7	Q Okay. If you would turn to page three of	09:12:34
8	Exhibit 135, I'll just point your attention to topics	09:12:36
9	two and five.	09:12:40
10	Topic two is your advertising promotional	09:12:43
11	marketing and other informational materials and	09:12:47
12	communications relating to the services you market or	09:12:49
13	perform on or connection or in connection with	09:12:52
14	EndoWrist instruments.	09:12:58
15	Do you see topic two?	09:13:01
16	A Yes.	09:13:02
17	Q And are you prepared to testify on behalf	09:13:02
18	of SIS regarding topic two?	09:13:06
19	A Yes.	09:13:07
20	Q All right. And topic five is your	09:13:07
21	relationship with Restore Robotics, LLC; Restore	09:13:09
22	Robotics Repairs, LLC; MediVision, Inc.; Clif Parker	09:13:16
23	Robotics, LLC; Rebotix Repair, LLC; and Benjamin	09:13:21
24	Biomedical, Inc.	09:13:24
25	Do you see topic five?	09:13:26
		Page 11

Case 3:21-cv-03496-AMO Document 230-52 Filed 05/17/24 Page 7 of 11 *** CONFIDENTIAL ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY ***

1	A Yes.	09:13:28
2	Q And are you prepared to testify regarding	09:13:28
3	topic five on behalf of SIS?	09:13:30
4	A Yes, I am.	09:13:33
5	Q All right. How did you prepare to testify	09:13:34
6	regarding topics two and five in our notice to SIS?	09:13:40
7	A My preparation was with our legal team.	09:13:47
8	Q Okay. And what did you do to prepare	09:13:53
9	yourself so that you would be ready to answer questions	09:13:56
10	regarding topics two and five in the notice?	09:13:58
11	A It was more of a general discussion with	09:14:01
12	Josh and Rick about this proceeding today and what we	09:14:06
13	would be doing.	09:14:11
14	The items listed are things that I'm	09:14:11
15	comfortable with because it's especially topic two	09:14:14
16	is something I do every day involved in customer	09:14:19
17	communication and marketing of our services.	09:14:24
18	Q So, from your perspective, based on your	09:14:25
19	role at SIS, there was not further preparation that you	09:14:27
20	needed to do to be ready to testify on these topics on	09:14:30
21	behalf of SIS; is that fair?	09:14:34
22	A That's fair, no.	09:14:36
23	Q Just so we're clear, did you review any	09:14:37
24	documents in preparation for the deposition?	09:14:40
25	A I did review	09:14:42
		Page 12

Case 3:21-cv-03496-AMO Document 230-52 Filed 05/17/24 Page 8 of 11 *** CONFIDENTIAL ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY ***

1	then eventually expanded?	12:10:58
2	A Yes.	12:11:03
3	Q In the first paragraph, top left corner of	12:11:03
4	the page, the second sentence referring to "robotic	12:11:10
5	assisted surgeries" says (as read):	12:11:14
6	These ground breaking procedures are	12:11:17
7	saving lives, reducing surgical site	12:11:18
8	infections, and improving patient	12:11:21
9	outcomes.	12:11:24
10	Do you see that sentence?	12:11:25
11	A Yes.	12:11:27
12	Q Does SIS agree that robotic assisted	12:11:27
13	surgery provides those benefits?	12:11:31
14	MR. VAN HOVEN: Objection to form.	12:11:32
15	THE REPORTER: I'm sorry, Mr. Johnson, I	12:11:46
16	didn't hear your answer.	12:11:47
17	THE WITNESS: Yes, I would agree.	12:11:49
18	BY MR. CHAPUT:	12:11:50
19	Q What is the point of comparison? So	12:11:56
20	saving lives compared to what, or reducing surgical	12:11:58
21	site infections compared to what?	12:12:03
22	A I feel that the the value that the	12:12:24
23	robot brings from a quality of surgery aspect has done	12:12:42
24	some pretty great things for the hospitals, for health	12:12:48
25	care.	12:12:51
		Page 101

Case 3:21-cv-03496-AMO Document 230-52 Filed 05/17/24 Page 9 of 11 *** CONFIDENTIAL ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY ***

1	Q Okay. And I'm just trying to understand,	12:12:51
2	what is that in comparison to? Is that in comparison	12:12:55
3	to laparoscopic surgery, open surgical modality, or	12:12:59
4	both?	12:13:05
5	A In 25 years of doing this, being involved	12:13:05
6	in surgery, you know, our biggest problem is that we're	12:13:08
7	humans, and I think that the robot helps correct some	12:13:11
8	human errors when it comes to the actual procedure	12:13:17
9	itself.	12:13:20
10	Q And, when you're saying that it helps to	12:13:20
11	correct human errors when it comes to the actual	12:13:28
12	procedure, you're you're comparing that to if the	12:13:30
13	same procedure were performed by a surgeon using an	12:13:33
14	open modality or an traditional laparoscopic modality;	12:13:37
15	is that right?	12:13:43
16	MR. VAN HOVEN: Objection to form.	12:13:43
17	THE WITNESS: Well, there's not going a	12:13:44
18	comparison in infections between open and laparoscopic.	12:13:47
19	That's that's not even a question for anybody. The	12:13:50
20	infection rate is going to be substantially lower in a	12:13:52
21	laparoscopic procedure.	12:13:56
22	But I think, in my professional opinion,	12:13:58
23	that the robot does bring some value when it comes to	12:14:04
24	patient outcomes.	12:14:07
25	///	
		Page 102

Case 3:21-cv-03496-AMO Document 230-52 Filed 05/17/24 Page 10 of 11 *** CONFIDENTIAL ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY ***

1	BY MR. CHAPUT:	12:14:12
2	Q So the comparison as to surgical site	12:14:14
3	infections, you're saying, would be specific to a	12:14:16
4	comparison between an open modality and the robotic	12:14:19
5	assisted surgical modality; is that right?	12:14:23
6	A Can you ask that question one more time?	12:14:34
7	Q Sure.	12:14:36
8	The comparison here SIS says that	12:14:36
9	robotic assisted surgeries are reducing surgical site	12:14:43
10	infections, and so I'm trying to understand, reduce	12:14:47
11	it reducing surgical site infections compared to	12:14:51
12	what, and my understanding from what you just said	12:14:54
13	about laparoscopic surgeries would be that the	12:14:57
14	comparison would be to open procedures; is that right?	12:14:59
15	MR. VAN HOVEN: Objection to form.	12:15:01
16	THE WITNESS: I would agree with that.	12:15:06
17	BY MR. CHAPUT:	12:15:07
18	Q There is an asterisk in that same section	12:15:12
19	in the top left with some italicized text, and it reads	12:15:15
20	(as read):	12:15:15
21	The Si EndoWrist inspection and	12:15:19
22	recovery program does not conflict with	12:15:25
23	any OEM warranties or service programs.	12:15:26
24	Do you see that sentence?	12:15:30
25	A Yes.	12:15:30
		Page 103

Case 3:21-cv-03496-AMO Document 230-52 Filed 05/17/24 Page 11 of 11 *** CONFIDENTIAL ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY ***

1	STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
2) ss.
3	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES)
4	I, Vickie Blair, CSR No. 8940, RPR-CRR, in
5	and for the State of California, do hereby certify:
6	That, prior to being examined, the witness
7	named in the foregoing deposition was by me duly sworn
8	to testify as to the truth, the whole truth, and
9	nothing but the truth;
10	That said deposition was taken before me
11	at the time and place therein set forth, and was taken
12	down by me stenographically and thereafter transcribed
13	via computer-aided transcription under my direction and
14	is a true record of the testimony given;
15	I further certify I am neither counsel
16	for, nor related to, any party to said action, nor
17	interested in the outcome thereof;
18	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereto
19	subscribed my name this 5th day of November, 2022.
20	
21	
22	
23	0):
24	Victor Palai
25	Vickie Blair, CSR No. 8940, RPR-CRR
	Page 119